

WITH CORRECTIONS VIA ADDENDA #1 THROUGH #7**SECTION 3. EVALUATION CRITERIA AND SELECTION PROCEDURE****3.1 EVALUATION CRITERIA**

Evaluation of the proposals will be performed by a committee established for that purpose and will be based on the criteria set forth below and developed from both the technical proposal and financial proposal. In evaluating the proposals, technical merit will have greater weight than financial.

**3.1.1 Technical Proposal Selection Criteria**

The criteria to be applied to each primary functional area proposed are listed below in order of descending importance:

- General Corporate Experience, Qualifications, Capabilities and Past Performance
- Program Management
- Corporate System Methodology
- Resumes
- Financial Stability
- ~~Top Five~~ Information Technology Challenges for the State
- Economic Benefit Factors

**3.1.2 Technical Proposal Criteria Definitions**

**This section provides sub-factor details for each of the factors listed in Section 3.1.1. Each of the sub-factors listed under the identified factor in this section is in descending order of precedence.**

**3.1.2.1 General Corporate Experience, Qualifications, Capabilities and Past Performance**

The Offeror will be evaluated on past experience with similar projects and pertinent corporate resources. The State will review the offeror's overview of its experience rendering services similar to those included in Section 2.0 (Specification) of this RFP, which should include a summary of the services offered and the number of years the Offeror has provided these services.

The State will then assess the Offeror's description of the corporate resources that will be available to support this Contract including any existing data centers that would be available to support the State requirements,

Finally, the State will evaluate the Offeror's past performance qualifications and client reference surveys for each functional area for which they are applying; and will also review the past performance qualification for each subcontractor proposed.

**3.1.2.2 Program Management**

The State will evaluate the Offeror's overall approach of managing this Contract and satisfying the requirements of the solicitation. The items that will be evaluated include:

---

**WITH CORRECTIONS VIA ADDENDA #1 THROUGH #7**

*Vision/Understanding* - The Offeror's vision or understanding of the services to be provided. This should demonstrate the understanding of the business entity's services expected under this Contract.

*Project Management Methodology* - The Offeror's approach to managing the overall project and individual Master Task or Task Orders issued under the awarded Contract. In assessing the overall Project Management approach the State will be looking for the following items:

- Project Organization (including identification and role of non-MBE subcontractors)
- ~~Project~~ **Program** Manager
- Task Leads
- Team Staffing Resources
- Support Resources
- Project Management Planning and Tracking System
- Project Reporting

In reviewing the Project Management Methodology for Master Task and Task Orders the following items will be assessed:

- Task Order Processing
- Task Order Control
  - Cost Controls
  - Schedule Control
  - Problem Tracking and Resolution
  - Risk Assessment and Management
- Task Order Staffing
- Monthly Progress/Status Reporting
- Quality Assurance
- Subcontractor Management
- Purchasing
- Management Planning and Reporting

### **3.1.2.3 Corporate System Methodology**

The State will evaluate the Offeror's System Development Methodology, which must be the Offeror's standard approach to the development of a system as part or all of a Task Order issued under the awarded Contract. The methodology needs to also indicate how the Offeror will ensure that all its team members properly employ its standardized approach.

In reviewing the System Development Methodology the State will be looking for the following:

- Basic principles of the system development approach;
- The steps involved in the development methodology;

**WITH CORRECTIONS VIA ADDENDA #1 THROUGH #7**

- A description of all automated tools that support the various steps in the development methodology;
- The quality control and product assurance techniques employed;
- The configuration management procedures used;
- The variations in the development methodology, if any, for systems that are: mainframe based; client-server systems; PC-based applications; systems involving database management systems; communications intensive systems; and systems requiring transition from legacy environments and applications; and,
- How the Systems Development Methodology interfaces/interacts with the proposed Project Management Methodology.

Offeror, specifically the bidding element or component of the organization **responding to functional areas defined in Sections 2.4.1, 2.4.2, or 2.4.5,** will be rated **evaluated** on its Capability Maturity Model or equivalent methodology **project management and systems processes that** will be used in the development of systems or applications under the awarded Contract if CMM is required for any of the functional areas being bid. **Offerors shall have project management and system development processes they employ as an organization. These processes should be followed by Offeror's staff and subcontractors when working on a task order project. The Offers shall state their system development and project management processes to include:**

- i. A detailed description of the organization's standard systems engineering and/or software development process, including a description of the documentation, standards used by the Offeror to ensure that its employees and subcontractors are required to follow the process;**
- ii. The approved or recommended development life cycles required to be employed by the Offeror's staff or subcontractors;**
- iii. The project management processes employed by the Offeror including a description of the measurements collected and tracked during the project life and how success is measured;**
- iv. A description of how these processes have been used on previous engagements in enough detail to clearly show that the processes are a repeatable part of the Offeror's process discipline; and,**
- v. A description of how the Offeror will work with the State to ensure the above-defined processes are employed and followed.**

#### **3.1.2.4 Resumes**

Resumes shall be provided for key personnel only. NO OTHER RESUMES should be supplied. A table of the key personnel labor categories by functional area is provided in Attachment I.

The State will assess the quality of the resumes which must contain detailed explanation of personnel education, experience, training, recent relevant experience, and size and scope of projects supported.

WITH CORRECTIONS VIA ADDENDA #1 THROUGH #7**3.1.2.5 Financial Stability**

The State will be judging the financial stability of the Offeror based on the following submittals:

- a) The last two (2) year-end Financial Statements and Annual Reports (audited preferred).
- b) A letter addressed to the State setting forth the following:
  - Discuss and provide evidence that the Offeror has financial capacity to provide the services the State is seeking in this RFP.
  - A statement as to whether there are any outstanding legal actions and/or contract terminations against the Offeror. This is not a discussion, or opinion, of the merits of these actions. This is to identify actions/claims that may assist the State in assessing an Offeror's responsibility.

**3.1.2.6 ~~Top Five~~ Information Technology Challenges for the State**

The Offerors will be evaluate based on their identification of the ~~Top Five (5)~~ Information Technology challenges the State will need to address and solve in the next five (5) years.

The Offeror is required to explain why these ~~five (5)~~ challenges were selected.

For each challenge, the Offeror must state clearly and concisely the nature of the challenge and its significance to the State. The issues that these challenges raise need to be discussed in sufficient detail to show the Offeror's understanding and insight. Next, the Offeror must present a plan of action illustrating how the Offeror will work with the State to meet this challenge. This action plan should also contain a schedule of tasks and a rough order of magnitude estimate of the Offeror's labor hours by job category to support these activities. Finally, the Offeror needs to explain what parts of its team would support which efforts of the proposed set of tasks.

**3.1.2.7 Economic Benefit Factors**

The Offeror will be evaluated on a narrative provided in their proposal describing benefits that will accrue to the Maryland economy as a direct or indirect result of their performance of this Contract.

Proposals will be evaluated to assess the benefit to Maryland's economy specifically offered. Factors to be considered are:

The anticipated types of activities that will be performed in Maryland, directly, or indirectly through Maryland based subcontractors, suppliers, etc. Along with a description of such anticipated activities, as feasible, provide the potential number of Maryland residents to be employed and/or the estimated percentage of projected workforce that will be Maryland residents, whether such projected employment will be at (a) site(s) in Maryland, and reasonable substantiation for all such projects.

---

**WITH CORRECTIONS VIA ADDENDA #1 THROUGH #7****3.1.3 Financial Proposal Selection Criteria**

Financial Proposals will be evaluated separately. The financial evaluation will be based upon the prices submitted by the offeror on the Financial Proposal Forms (Attachment E). Attachment E consists of: 8 separate service category Tables E-1 Through E-8, and; 2 separate ASP Tables E-9.1 and E-9.2. For Tables E-1 through E-8, Offerors must propose prices, **for contractor site and government site for all contract years**, in the appropriate table for all labor classes within that service category and as specified in the Attachment I. **Base contract years are years 1, 2 and 3. Option contract years are 4 and 5. These are the prices the State will pay for all defined labor.** The offeror will record the unit prices, **for base contract years and option contract years**, in the columns label Offeror's Price. These entries will be multiplied by the State provided factor in the column labeled State Factor. The result of this calculation will be recorded in the appropriate columns labeled as Evaluated Price. The prices in the Evaluated Price columns will be added to produce the result in the boxes in the row labeled the "Total Composite Labor Rate". The 10 "Total Composite Labor Rate" prices will be then be averaged and the result recorded in the row labeled "Average Total Composite Labor Rate". The "Average Total Composite Labor Rate" will establish the financial ranking of each offeror from the lowest to the highest in each of the offered service categories. Offerors proposing ASP must in addition to completing Table E-8, complete, as appropriate, Tables E-9.1 and E-9.2. The ASP financial ranking will be determined by the "Average Total Composite Labor Rate" of Table E-8 and the Tables E-9 will fix the prices for the offered base set services by the ASP.

**3.2 SELECTION PROCEDURE**

The Contract will be awarded in accordance with the competitive sealed proposals process under Code of Maryland Regulations 21.05.03. The competitive sealed proposals method is based on discussions and revision of proposals during these discussions.

Accordingly, the State may hold discussions with all Offerors judged reasonably susceptible of being selected for award. However, the State also reserves the right to make an award without holding discussions. In either case of holding discussions or not doing so, the State may determine an Offeror to be not responsible and/or not reasonably susceptible of being selected for award, at any time after the initial closing date for receipt of proposals. Financial proposals of qualified Offerors will be opened only after all technical proposals have been evaluated.

After a review of the financial proposals of qualified Offerors, the Procurement Officer may again conduct discussions with the Offerors. Offerors must confirm in writing any substantive oral clarification of their proposals made in the course of discussions. When in the best interest of the State, the Procurement Officer may permit Offerors who have submitted acceptable proposals to revise their initial proposals and submit in writing best and final offers.

Upon completion of all discussions and negotiations, reference checks, and site visits, if any, the Procurement Officer will recommend award of a Contract to the responsible Offerors whose proposals are determined to be the most advantageous to the State, considering price and the evaluation factors set forth in this RFP. In making this determination, technical merit will receive greater weight than price.

WITH CORRECTIONS VIA ADDENDA #1 THROUGH #7

**BALANCE OF PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK**